UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,145	03/29/2004	William Edmund Cranstoun Kentish	282568US8X	2154

22850   7590   11/07/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
FLANDERS, ANDREW C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/07/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 July 2008</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is FINAL.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,6-28,32 and 36-41</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-3,6-28,32 and 36-41</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 March 2004</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 24 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

Applicant alleges:

> However, Applicants respectfully submit that the features of
> amended Claim 1 provide several advantages not taught by the method
> described in Taro. Specifically, the band data components of the encoded
> audio signal are altered by combining or replacing one or more of the
> band data components **with corresponding band data components** of a
> spectrally-encoded audio watermark signal. For example, both the audio
> signal and the watermark signal could be compressed MP3 audio signals.
> To this end, band components of the MP3 watermark signal are used to
> replace or modify corresponding components of the audio signal.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Interpreting the claim as broadly as possible in

light of the specification, Taro meets the above limitations. Specifically, Taro teaches

embedding the third key into one of the separated frequency bands; para 81. This third

key thus must correspond with one of the band data components as it is replacing it.

For example, if there are 4 frequency bands, A, B, C and D, Taro will replace one of

these with the watermark. If one replaces A, then the watermark will correspond to that

band data, if B then it corresponds to that band data and so on.   Thus, in further detail,

Taro discloses: replacing one or more of said band data components (i.e. embedding

the third key into one of the plurality of bands) with corresponding band data (i.e. the

watermark corresponding to the band it is replacing as shown in the example above),

from a spectrally-encoded digital audio watermark signal (third key is watermark

information, replacing a specific spectral band meets "spectrally encoded.").

Applicant further alleges:

> Conversely, the method described in Taro does not utilize
> corresponding components of already compressed digital audio signals,
> and instead relies on a complicated technique in which multiple signals
> must be added to achieve a result. For example, Taro must generate new
> signals such as: antiphase analogue signals to cancel out the applied
> noise,6 potentially inaudible key data,7 potentially inaudible watermark,8
> audible noise or announcement,9 and music ID information, lo As such,
> Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 patentably defines
> over Taro.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is not necessary to meet already compressed

digital audio signals as they are not explicitly claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 28 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the

claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 - 3, 6 – 25 claim a method. These method claims are not tied to the

corresponding apparatus and thus are non statutory. Further, these claims contain a

judicial exception in the form of a computer program. The final result of the process, i.e.

the sorting the results in a memory, appears to be a useful, tangible and concrete result

on its face. However, review of the spec discloses a possible memory/storage medium

as a network connection. Signals are not tangible and thus the final result cannot be

considered a useful, tangible and concrete result.

Claims 26 and 27 claim a method. These method claims are not tied to the

corresponding apparatus and thus are non statutory.

Claims 28 and 32 claim A computer readable medium. The specification on

page 4 lines 10 – 17 teaches the computer readable medium. One disclosed computer

readable medium is a transmission medium such as the network connection. Thus, the

computer readable medium can be interpreted as nothing more than a signal. A signal

does not fall within one of the four enumerated statutory categories and thus is non

statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

    1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
    2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
    3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
    4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
         obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 28, 32 and 36 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taro (EP 1 189 362 A2).

Regarding **Claim 1**, Taro discloses:

A method of processing a spectrally-encoded digital audio signal (title and abstract) comprising band data components representing audio contributions in respective frequency bands (separating the audio data with frequency band separator 401; para 78), said method comprising the steps of:

altering a subset comprising one or more of said band data components by combining or replacing one or more of said band data components by corresponding

band data components from a spectrally-encoded digital audio watermark signal (i.e.

embedding the keys, as watermarks, into one of the bands; embodiment 2) to produce a

band-altered digital audio signal having altered band data components (embedding

various keys within the frequency bands; see second embodiment); and

generating recovery data to allow original values of said altered band data

components to be reconstructed (i.e. the generation of the keys used in decryption/ or

reading the keys out from storage; second embodiment).

in which said altering step comprises replacing one or more of said band data

components by corresponding band data components from a spectrally-encoded digital

audio watermark signal (i.e. embedding the keys, as watermarks, into one of the bands;

embodiment 2).

Taro fails to explicitly disclose that the audio watermark signal is multiplied by a

scaling factor. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to multiply the watermark signal by a scale factor. Taro

recognizes that it is desirable to ensure the signal is inaudible and scaling the signal

would ensure this was achieved. Scaling the signal would not alter the output so long

as the scale factor was chosen such that the signal was still recoverable during

restoration.

Regarding **Claim 2**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim

1, Taro further discloses:

comprising the step of encrypting said recovery data (i.e encryption using the keys; second embodiment).

Regarding **Claim 3**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 1, Taro further discloses:

in which said recovery data comprises said subset of said band data components (i.e. the keys are embedded into the band data and are integral; second embodiment).

Regarding **Claim 6**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 1, Taro further discloses:

in which said subset of said band data components is a predetermined subset of said band data components (i.e. telephone voice band, low and high frequency band; embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 7**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 1, Taro further discloses:

in which said recovery data defines which of said band data components are in said subset of said band data components (i.e. certain keys are embedded into certain bands; embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 8**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 4, Taro further discloses:

detecting which of said band data components of said watermark signal are most

significant over at least a portion of said watermark signal (i.e. the system determines

the least significant bit, during this determination it must also determine the most

significant bit in order to accurately identify the LSB; para 82), said most significant

band data components forming said subset of said band data components (these most

and least significant portions all make up the band data components; i.e. subbands

produced by the frequency separation; embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 9**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim

8, Taro further discloses:

in which said detecting step comprises detecting which of said band data

components of said watermark signal are most significant over the entirety of said

watermark signal (to determine the LSB and MSB, the entirety of the signal must be

analyzed).

Regarding **Claim 10**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim

8, Taro further discloses:

in which said watermark signal and said digital audio signal are each encoded as

successive data frames representing respective time periods of said watermark signal

and said digital audio signal (i.e. the frequency encoded signal represents a time

domain signal encoded in a format that sets successive bands respectively) said

detecting step comprising:

detecting which of said band data components of said watermark signal are most significant over a group of one or more of said data frames of said watermark signal, said most significant band data components forming said subset of said band data components in respect of a corresponding group of one or more frames of said digital audio signal (i.e. the system determines the least significant bit, during this determination it must also determine the most significant bit in order to accurately identify the LSB; para 82).

Regarding **Claim 11**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 5, Taro further discloses:

detecting which of said band data components of said watermark signal are most significant over at least a portion of said watermark signal (i.e. the system determines the least significant bit, during this determination it must also determine the most significant bit in order to accurately identify the LSB; para 82)., said most significant band data components forming said subset of said band data components (these bits are part of the sub band components of the signal; embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 12**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 11, Taro further discloses:

in which said detecting step comprises detecting which of said band data components of said watermark signal are most significant over the entirety of said watermark signal (i.e. the system determines the least significant bit, during this

determination it must also determine the most significant bit in order to accurately identify the LSB; para 82).

Regarding **Claim 13**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 11, Taro further discloses:

in which said watermark signal and said digital audio signal are each encoded as successive data frames representing respective time periods of said watermark signal and said digital audio signal (i.e. the frequency encoded signal represents a time domain signal encoded in a format that sets successive bands respectively) said detecting step comprising:

detecting which of said band data components of said watermark signal are most significant over a group of one or more of said data frames of said watermark signal, said most significant band data components forming said subset of said band data components in respect of a corresponding group of one or more frames of said digital audio signal (i.e. the system determines the least significant bit, during this determination it must also determine the most significant bit in order to accurately identify the LSB; para 82).

Regarding **Claim 14**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 11, Taro further discloses:

comprising the step of detecting which of said band data components of said watermark signal differ most significantly from corresponding band data components of

said digital audio signal over at least corresponding portions of said watermark signal

and said digital audio signal(i.e. the system determines the least significant bit, during

this determination it must also determine the most significant bit in order to accurately

identify the LSB; para 82)., said most significantly differing band data components

forming said subset of said band data components (these most and least significant

portions all make up the band data components; i.e. subbands produced by the

frequency separation; embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 15**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim

5, Taro further discloses:

comprising the step of detecting which of said band data components of said

watermark signal differ most significantly from corresponding band data components of

said digital audio signal over at least corresponding portions of said watermark signal

and said digital audio signal(i.e. the system determines the least significant bit, during

this determination it must also determine the most significant bit in order to accurately

identify the LSB; para 82)., said most significantly differing band data components

forming said subset of said band data components (these most and least significant

portions all make up the band data components; i.e. subbands produced by the

frequency separation; embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 16**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 5, Taro further discloses:

in which said band data components forming said subset of said band data components are defined by a pseudo-random function (Taro discloses using MP3 or AAC encoding, both of which employ pseudo-random functionality).

Regarding **Claim 17**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 1, Taro further discloses:

in which said digital audio signal is stored (storing the resultant encrypted audio) in a data format having at least:

format-defining data specifying a quantity of data available to store said digital audio signal (AAC or MP3);

said band data components (frequency encoded audio; mp3 or AAC); and

zero or more ancillary data space (key data stored in frequency bands; inaudible area).

Regarding **Claim 18**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 17, Taro further discloses:

comprising the step of storing said recovery data in said ancillary data space (i.e. key data stored in the frequency bands in inaudible portions).

Regarding **Claim 19**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 17, Taro further discloses:

comprising the step of altering said format-defining data to specify a larger quantity of data to store said digital audio signal, thereby increasing the size of said ancillary data space (i.e. MP3 and AAC can have their characteristics changed to enable larger storage, more bits or less depending on user preferences. alteration would allow for more frequency bands and thus more ancillary data space).

Regarding **Claim 20**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 1, Taro further discloses:

comprising the step of appending said recovery data to said band-altered digital audio signal (i.e. embedding keys into the sub bands; embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 21**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 1, Taro further discloses:

comprising the step of adjusting the number of said band data components in said subset of said band data components in accordance with the data capacity available for said recovery data (i.e. band filtering using minimum or maximum frequency band components; col. 12 embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 24**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 1, Taro further discloses:

A method of distributing spectrally-encoded audio content material, said method comprising the steps of:

processing said spectrally-encoded audio content material in accordance with the method of claim 1 to form a band-altered digital signal and recovery data (see rejection of claim 1 above);

encrypting said recovery data to form encrypted recovery data (i.e. encrypting the bands with embedded keys; embodiment 2);

supplying said band-altered digital signal and said encrypted recovery data to a receiving user (sending the encrypted data to an audio player; embodiment 2); and

supplying a decryption key to said receiving user to allow said receiving user to decrypt said encrypted recovery data (i.e. the encrypted audio data includes various keys; embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 25**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claim 24, Taro further discloses:

in which said supplying step takes place only if a payment is received from said receiving user (i.e. content provider an urge the user to pay a fee for the music; page 9).

Regarding **Claim 26** in addition to the elements stated above regarding claim 1 Taro further discloses:

A method of receiving spectrally-encoded audio content material, said method comprising the steps of:

receiving a band-altered digital signal and encrypted recovery data from a
content provider, said band-altered digital signal and said recovery data having been
generated by combining or replacing one or more band data components with
corresponding band data components form a spectrally-encoded digital audio
watermark signal, multiplied by a scaling factor to produce a band-altered digital audio
signal having altered band data components (See rejection of claim 1);

generating recovery data to allow original values of said altered band data
components to be reconstructed (See rejection of claim 1);

receiving a decryption key to allow decryption of said encrypted recovery data
(i.e. the keys which are embedded are sent to the audio player; embodiment 2);

decrypting said encrypted recovery data to form decrypted recovery data (using
the keys to decrypt the audio data; embodiment 2);

processing said band-altered digital signal by altering said subset of said band
data components in accordance with said recovery data to reconstruct said original
values of said subset of said band data components (decoding the received encrypted
signal for playback; embodiment 2); and

reproducing audio content based on the reconstructed original values of said
subset of said band data components (decryption and playback as taught in
Embodiment 2).

Regarding **Claim 27**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claim
26, Taro further discloses:

Providing a payment to said content provider (i.e. content provider an urge the user to pay a fee for the music; page 9).

Regarding **Claims 28 and 32**, Claims 28 and 32 claim various forms of software for performing the above methods. Taro does not explicitly disclose software for performing the functions but they are extremely obvious if not inherently present. Taro discloses various computer related modules and also discloses compressing audio data. Audio compression is typically done using software in the art. While it can be done in other ways, software provides the cheapest and easiest implementation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the system using software. Its cheap and easy implementation would be desirable in the system.

Claims 22 – 23, 36 – 39 and 41 claim the same limitations as the claims above and are rejected under the same grounds.

Regarding **Claim 40**, in addition to the elements disclosed above regarding claim 38, Taro fails to explicitly disclose using a set top box. However, set top boxes are notoriously well known to include audio and pay per view events in the cable television art. IT would be desirable to implement the features of Taro to a typical set to box to prevent piracy in a pay per view television event.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW C. FLANDERS whose telephone number is (571)272-7516. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew C Flanders/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2614

/CURTIS KUNTZ/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614